

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated October 7, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 have been amended. New claim 9 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, and 6-8 and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,729 to *Cracraft* (hereinafter “*Cracraft*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Cracraft* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-8. Thus, *Cracraft* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a washing machine control method comprising, among other features, “incrementing a counter based on a number of times water is re-supplied to the washing machine” and “comparing the number of times water is re-supplied to a pre-determined value.” The Applicant submits that *Cracraft* does not disclose incrementing a counter based on the number of times water is re-supplied to a washing machine. Similarly, *Cracraft* does not disclose comparing the number of times water is

re-supplied to a pre-determined value. Accordingly, claim 1 is, as are claims 2-8 which depend therefrom, patentable over *Cracraft* and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Korean Publication No. KR 99027766 to *Song* (hereinafter “*Song*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Song does not disclose all the features recited in claims 1-8. Thus, *Song* cannot anticipate these claims. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite a washing machine control method comprising, among other features, “determining an amount of water absorbed by the laundry during a predetermined time period by sensing a current water level in the washing machine after the predetermined time period has elapsed,” “re-supplying water to the washing machine, wherein the operation of re-supplying water compensates for the amount of water absorbed by the laundry,” “incrementing a counter based on a number of times water is re-supplied to the washing machine,” “comparing the number of times water is re-supplied to a predetermined value,” and “resetting the initial second water level based on the comparison.” The Applicant submits that *Song* does not disclose any of these features. While *Song* generally discloses a washing method of a washing machine, the reference does not disclose any of the operations listed above. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over *Song* and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Cracraft*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior

art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Cracraft* does not disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1-8. As previously discussed, *Cracraft* does not disclose a washing machine control method comprising, among other features, “incrementing a counter based on a number of times water is re-supplied to the washing machine” and “comparing the number of times water is re-supplied to a pre-determined value.” Similarly, the Applicant submits that *Cracraft* does not suggest these features. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are not obvious over *Cracraft* and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Office Action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Song*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Song* does not disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1-8. As mentioned above, *Song* does not disclose a washing machine control method comprising, among other features, “determining an amount of water absorbed by the laundry during a predetermined time period by sensing a current water level in the washing machine after the pre-determined time period has elapsed,” “re-supplying water to the washing machine, wherein the operation of re-supplying water compensates for the amount of water absorbed by the laundry,” “incrementing a counter based on a number of times water is re-supplied to the washing machine,” “comparing the number of times water is re-supplied to a pre-determined value,” and “resetting the initial second water level based on the comparison.” Similarly, *Song* does not suggest any of these features. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 1-8 are not obvious over *Song* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Applicant has added new claim 9. The Applicant submits that claim 9 defines subject matter not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s

Application No.: 10/720,748
Amdt. dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated October 7, 2005

Docket No.: 9988.091.00

representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant